BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION
CLAIM NO. H505686

CLIFTON L. HINNANT,
EMPLOYEE **CLAIMANT**

CITY OF LITTLE ROCK,
EMPLOYER **RESPONDENT**

ARK. MUNICIPAL LEAGUE WORKERS' COMP. TRUST/
RICK MG'T SOLUTIONS, INC.,
CARRIER/TPA **RESPONDENT**

OPINION FILED JULY 16, 2026,
DENYING RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE FILED MAY 14, 2026

Hearing conducted on Tuesday, July 14, 2026, before the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission (the Commission), Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Mike Pickens, in Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas.

The claimant, Mr. Clifton L. Hinnant, of North Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas, appeared pro se.

The respondents were represented by the Honorable Melissa Wood, Worley, Wood & Parrish, P.A., Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A hearing was conducted on June 26, 2026, to determine whether this claim should be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to ***Ark. Code Ann.*** § 11-9-702(a)(4) (2025 Lexis Replacement) and 11 ***CAR*** Section 25-110(d) (2025 ***Code of AR Regulations***), formerly cited as Commission Rule 099.13 (2025 Lexis Repl.)

On September 4, 2025, the claimant filed a Form AR-C alleging a work-related injury to his left ear, and the respondents filed an amended Form AR-2 on September 24, 2026. (Respondents' Exhibit 1 at 2 and 3; Hearing Transcript). The respondents accepted this injury and paid both medical and indemnity benefits, including permanent partial disability (PPD) benefits based on a

two percent (2%) permanent anatomical impairment rating. The claimant had been working for the City of Little Rock (the City) for some time and was still employed with the City and working with them at his same job on the date of the hearing. To date the claimant has never retained or been represented by counsel in this matter. The ALJ both advised him of the services he may access through the Commission's Legal Advisors Division and strongly encouraged him to retain a workers' compensation lawyer to represent him in this matter. (Hearing Transcript).

On May 14, 2026, the respondents filed with the Commission a motion to dismiss this claim without prejudice (MTD). (RX1 at 4-5). The claimant was provided due and legal notice of the date, time and place of the hearing and, although he admitted he never filed a written objection to the respondents' MTD, he did appear in person at the hearing and registered his objection to it on the record and requested a hearing to determine whether he has a compensable post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) injury within the meaning of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Act (the Act), as well as his entitlement, if any, to the benefits he checked on the Form AR-C he filed with the Commission on September 4, 2025. (RX1 at 6-7; 2; and Hearing Transcript).

The record herein consists of the hearing transcript and any and all exhibits contained therein or attached thereto.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with ***Ark. Code Ann.***§ 11-9-702(a)(4) (2025 Lexis Replacement), as well as our court of appeals' ruling in *Dillard vs. Benton County Sheriff's Office*, 87 Ark. App. 379, 192 S.W.3d 287 (Ark. App. 2004), the Commission scheduled and conducted a hearing on the respondents' MTD filed May 14, 2026. Rather than recite a detailed analysis of the record, suffice it to say the preponderance of the evidence introduced at the hearing and contained in the record reveals the claimant appeared in person at the subject MTD hearing and he both objected to his

claim being dismissed at this time, and he requested a hearing on the aforementioned outstanding issues in his claim as set forth in his Form AR-C filed with the Commission on September 4, 2025.

Therefore, after a thorough consideration of the issues at bar, the applicable law as applied to the facts of this claim, and other relevant matters of record including but not limited to the claimant's sworn testimony and the representations of a credible counsel, I hereby make the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction of this claim.

2. After having received due and legal notice of both the respondents' MTD without prejudice filed with the Commission on May 14, 2026, as well as due and legal notice of the date, time, and place of the subject hearing, the claimant appeared in person at the hearing, objected to his claim being dismissed, and requested the Commission hold a hearing on the issues set forth in his From AR-C which was filed with the Commission on September 4, 2025.

3. Therefore, the preponderance of the evidence compels the decision the respondents' MTD without prejudice filed May 14, 2026, should be and hereby is DENIED due to the claimant's objection and hearing request.

4. The ALJ's office shall promptly send the prehearing questionnaire documents to both the claimant and the respondents' attorney. Once the parties' have timely filed their respective responses with the Commission, the ALJ's office shall in due course schedule a prehearing teleconference in anticipation of scheduling a hearing on any and all outstanding issues.

If they have not already done so, the respondents hereby are ordered to pay the court reporter's invoice immediately upon their receipt thereof.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____

Mike Pickens
Administrative Law Judge

MP/mp